

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are presently pending and stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsai. Claim 21 is added.

Claim 1 recites, among other limitations "accessing an IMDCT sample from a previous set of IMDCT samples; accessing an IMDCT sample from a present set of IMDCT samples". Examiner has stated that Tsai discloses "accessing an IMDCT sample from a previous set of IMDCT samples ('X(2k+1)'); accessing an IMDCT sample from a present set of IMDCT samples ('X(2k)')", Office Action at 2.

Assignee respectfully calls Examiner's attention to Tsai, III-3218, §3.2 which states that "The overall architecture of IMDCT that combining windowing and overlap-add is shown in Figure 6." It is noted that notations "X(2k)" and "X(2k-1)" are inputs to the circuit in Figure 6. If "The overall architecture of IMDCT that combining windowing and overlap-add is shown in Figure 6", the inputs, X(2k) and X(2k-1) cannot be "IMDCT sample". Thus accordingly, Assignee respectfully submits that "accessing an IMDCT sample from a previous set of IMDCT samples; accessing an IMDCT sample from a present set of IMDCT samples" does not read on Tsai, Figure 6, X(2k), X(2k+1). Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 1, 7, and 15 and dependent claims 2-6, 8-14, and 16-20. For this reason alone, claims 1-20 should be allowed.

Furthermore, in the interests of clarity, Assignee has added claim 21 reciting, "wherein said IMDCT samples comprise reconstructed values from application of the Inverse Modified Discrete Cosine Transformation to modified

discrete cosine transformation values". For the above reasons, claim 21 clearly does not read on Tsai, Figure 6, $X(2k)$, $X(2k+1)$.

Claim 7 recites, among other limitations, "a first address register for accessing an IMDCT sample from a previous set of IMDCT samples; a second address register for accessing an IMDCT sample from a present set of IMDCT samples".

Examiner has stated that Tsai discloses "a first address register for accessing an IMDCT sample from a previous set of IMDCT samples (' $X(2k+1)$ ')"; a second address register for accessing an IMDCT sample from a present set of IMDCT samples (' $X(2k)$ ')", Office Action at 2.

Assignee respectfully traverses and notes that Figure 6 does not even show a register, much less an address register. Accordingly, for this reason alone, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 8-14.

Moreover, claim 16, which appears to be rejected on the same basis of claim 7, recites "a first address register for referencing a memory location in the first memory, the memory location in the first memory storing the IMDCT sample from the previous set of IMDCT samples; and a second address register for referencing a memory location in the second memory, the memory location in the second memory storing the IMDCT samples from the present set of IMDCT samples". Figure 6 clearly does not show "referencing a memory location in the first memory", and "referencing a memory location in the second memory". Accordingly, for this reason alone, Assignee traverses the rejection to claim 16 and request that Examiner withdraw it.

Claim 15 recites, among other limitations, "a processor". Examiner has indicated that Tsai discloses "a processor for executing a plurality of executable instructions". However, Examiner has not indicated with any degree of particularity where Tsai teaches "a processor for executing a plurality of executable instructions". It is noted that Figure 6 does not disclose the claimed "processor for executing a plurality of executable instructions".

With regards to claims 16-20, Examiner has indicated that "Claims 16-20 are similar in scope and content to claims 2-7 and are rejected with the same rationale." Claim 17 recites, among other limitations, "incrementing the first address register; and incrementing the second address register". Claim 20 recites, among other limitations, "incrementing the third address register; and decrementing the fourth address register". Assignee cannot ascertain how it is that Examiner can assert that these claims "are similar in scope and content to claims 2-7" when none of claims 2-7 even recite "incrementing".

Accordingly, Assignee traverses the rejections to claims 17 and 19 and requests that Examiner withdraw the rejections.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with any actions requested herein to deposit account 13-0017.

August 16, 2007

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED



Mirut Dalal
Reg. No. 44,052
Attorney for Assignee

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison - Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Voice (312) 775-8000
FAX (312) 775-8100